

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-11, which are all of the pending claims. Claims 1-4, 6, 7 and 9-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being fully anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,411,989 (Anupam, et al.), and Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over Anupam, et al.

The specific basis for the rejection of Claim is not clear in the Office Action. The Examiner does not specifically state whether the claim was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 or §103. Moreover, the specific discussion of Claim 5 in paragraph 5 of the Office Action would appear to relate to Claim 3, not to Claim 5. Applicants would appreciate clarification of the specific basis for the rejection of Claim 5.

After carefully studying the claims, the prior art and the Office Action, Applicants herein ask that independent Claims 1, 9, 10 and 11 be amended to better define the subject matter of these claims.

For the reasons advanced below, Applicants believe that entry of this Amendment is appropriate and that Claims 1-11, as presented herewith, patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. The Examiner is thus respectfully requested to enter this amendment, to reconsider and to withdraw the rejections of Claims 1-11, and to allow these claims.

As discussed in Applicants' previous Amendment, the present invention generally relates to methods and systems for sharing an existing Web browser, allowing a high performance, real time collaborative effort among computer users. In order to achieve this, in accordance with this invention, a server embeds a PageManager into each page sent to a user machine. These

PageManagers are used to detect, to receive and to communicate page changes, and to manage communications, achieving the desired synchronization among the pages.

Anupam, et al, like the present invention, allows several users to input information simultaneously into a shared document. In order to do this, in Anupam, a central server downloads a surrogate into each user computer.

In the Office Action, the Examiner argued that this surrogate of Anupam, et al is the equivalent of the PageManager of the present invention. Applicants respectfully disagree.

While the surrogate of Anupam, et al, and the PageManager of this invention have some similarities, there also are important differences between this surrogate and the PageManager. One very important difference is that, with the present invention, the server embeds the PageManager into each page, while the surrogate of Anupam, et al. is not embedded into the pages that are sent to the user computers. Instead, in Anupam, et al., as discussed in Column 3, line 41 to Column 4, line 18, the surrogates are sent separately to the user computers.

As discussed in detail in the present application, the above-discussed feature of this invention is of utility because it eliminates the need to have the user computers match a page with the appropriate code for controlling or monitoring changes to the page.

The other references of record have been reviewed, and these other references, whether they are considered individually or in combination, also fail to teach or suggest this aspect of the present invention.

Applicants herein ask that independent Claims 1, 9, 10 and 11 be amended to describe more positively the above-discussed difference between the claims and the prior art. In particular, Claim 1 is being amended to indicate positively that the server includes means to embed the PageManager into each of the pages. Similarly, Claim 9, which is directed to a server

for sharing a browser, is being amended to include means for embedding into the page the PageManager currently described in the claim. Also, Claims 10 and 11 are being amended to indicate that the server, which is already described in each of these claims, is used for embedding the PageManager into the requested page.

In view of the above-discussed differences between Claims 1, 9 and 10 and the prior art, and in view of the advantages associated with those differences, it cannot be said that any of these claims is anticipated by or rendered obvious by Anupam, et al, or by the prior art as a whole. Consequently, Claims 1, 9 and 10 patentably distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. Claims 2-8 are dependent from Claim 1 and are allowable therewith. The Examiner is, thus, respectfully asked to reconsider and to withdraw the rejections of Claims 1-11, and to allow these claims.

The changes requested herein only emphasize differences between the claims and the prior art. For example, Claim 1 presently describes the server, the browser pages, and the PageManager, and expressly indicates that the PageManager is embedded into the pages. Claim 1 is being amended herein only to indicate expressly that it is the server that includes the means to embed the PageManager into those pages. Accordingly, it is believed that entry of this Amendment is appropriate, and such entry is respectfully requested.

For the reasons set forth above, the Examiner is asked to enter this Amendment, to reconsider and to withdraw the rejections of Claims 1-11 over Anupam, et al., and to allow these claims. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' Attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

John S. Sensny
John S. Sensny
Registration No. 28,757
Attorney for Applicants

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser
400 Garden City Plaza
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

JSS:jy